

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/769,672	ROMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Lopez	1731	

All Participants:

(1) Carlos Lopez.

(2) Adam Cox.

Date of Interview: 7 June 2004

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

22-23,28-30,34 and 38

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1pm


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)


 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted to applicant that claims 22-23 did not have support in the originally filed specification. The specification did not mention any melting step conducted at the claimed temperature. Applicant thus agreed to cancel claim 22 and any claim dependent thereof. Additionally agreed to include the higher range of the claimed "raising the temperature..." limitation as disclosed in page 3 of the specification.